



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/174,957 12/28/93 KAMIYAMA

S 024703006

EXAMINER

LEADER, W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

D1M1/1115

JAMES W. PETERSON
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS
GEO. MASON BLDG., WASH. & PRINCE STS.
P.O. BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

1102

DATE MAILED:

11/15/94

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 8/12/94 ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), - days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. ☐ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
3. ☐ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
5. ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6. ☐

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-17 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims 2-6 and 16 are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1, 7-15 and 17 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on . Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on , has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed , has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. ; filed on .
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 1102

Applicant has identified claims, 1, 7-15 and 17 or reading in the elected species.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 1 7-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Lowenheim.

The admitted prior art is that described on pages 1-5 of the

Serial No. 174,957

-3-


Art Unit 1102

specification and shows that process for etching aluminum and subsequently treating to promote improved corrosion resistance are known. See for example, Japanese document 1-212,775.

Applicant's claimed invention differs by reciting that the method for improving corrosion resistance is hydration oxidation treatment. Lowenheim disclose that processes of sealing aluminum by immersing in boiling water to promote hydration oxidation treatment is well known. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have included a step of hydration oxidation treatment in the process of the admitted prior art because this treatment is known to improve corrosion resistance.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to W. Leader whose telephone number is (703) 308-2530.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.


John Niebling
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Patent Examining Group 110

W. Leader:rg
November 01, 1994